

**REMARKS**

This patent application presently includes Claims 1-16, of which Claims 1, 2, 9 and 10 were rejected and Claims 3-8 and 11-16 were rejected as dependent from a rejected claim, but indicated as otherwise allowable.

On February 11, 2004, the undersigned held an interview with Examiner L. Lum in the presence of Supervisor L. Morris. The undersigned argued that in accordance with Morris, nothing more is disclosed than the acknowledged prior art of Fig. 1 of the present patent application. Figure 12 of Coles is clearly schematic, as the rotor is shown floating in space. Clearly, there would need to be some form of rotor core like 3 in Fig. 1 of the present application in order to support the outer portion of the rotor in Fig. 12 of Coles. Nevertheless, the undersigned was not able to demonstrate specifically that such a rotor core is present, although it is obvious from the nature of the figure. On this basis, the undersigned believes and, in fact, argued in the amendment of January 15, 2004 that the present invention distinguishes over Coles in that the magnets are fixed in a plurality of recesses provided in a *rotor core*. The examiner considered the rotor core to be the element between back iron sleeve 26 and rotor sleeve 28. However, this is in no sense a core as that term would be understood by those skilled in the art. It is, in fact, just a variation of mounting the magnets on the periphery of the rotor as shown in Fig. 1 of the present patent application.

Although the undersigned does not agree with the examiner's position and believes that those skilled in the art would agree with the undersigned, he is unable to demonstrate specifically that the motor shown schematically in Fig. 12 includes a rotor core inside of the element contained between the sleeves 26 and 28. Accordingly, in the interest of narrowing the issues in this application and placing it in a condition in which it would be allowed by the examiner, Claims 1 and 9 have been amended to recite that the magnets are surrounded on all sides by the rotor core. In Coles, even if the element contained between sleeves 26 and 28 is considered the rotor core, the magnets 27 are exposed on one side to the sleeve 28 and are therefore not surrounded by the rotor core on all sides.

This is believed to distinguish patentably over Coles, since, with the magnets surrounded by the rotor core, there is no possibility of scattering while the motor is rotating. This also has the advantage that a steering assisting force is obtained under field weakening control with high speed steering. The present invention therefore includes a feature not taught or suggested by the prior art which results in substantial advantages. Claims 1 and 9 are therefore believed to be allowable over Coles. Claims 2 and 10 depend from an allowable claim and are believed to be allowable based upon that dependence. The remaining claims are believed to be allowable for the same reasons, but as clearly recognized by the examiner, they also include subject matter which makes them allowable on their own merits.

Applicant's attorney has made every effort to place this patent application in condition for allowance. It is therefore earnestly requested that the present amendment be entered, that this patent application, as a whole, receive favorable reconsideration and that all of the claims be allowed as presently constituted. Should there remain any unanswered questions, the examiner is requested to call the applicant's undersigned attorney at the telephone number given below.

Dated:

Respectfully submitted,

By

Joseph B. Lerch

Registration No.: 26,936

DARBY & DARBY P.C.

P.O. Box 5257

New York, New York 10150-5257

(212) 527-7700

(212) 753-6237 (Fax)

Attorneys/Agents For Applicant